



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,567	06/28/2001	John R. Milton	10010930-1 ²	7963

7590 03/31/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,567

Applicant(s)

MILTON ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/06/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-13, 16-22 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-13, 16-22, and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments filed 01/06/06.
2. Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-22, and 25-27 are pending. Claims 5-6, 14-15, and 23-24 were cancelled by the amendment. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-22, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna et al., US 6,055,522, 4/25/00 (filed 6/19/97).

In reference to claim 1, Krishna teaches a dynamic content distributed publishing system. See abstract. Compare to ***"a method for formatting a publication"***. Krishna teaches the following:

-A server computer system coupled to a network where the server stores a content file containing a template file for publication. A page builder program that operates on a document template file to automatically produce a visual representation of each possible object and state of the template file consisting of a specification for a web page in terms of object content and actions to be taken on or between such objects. The object content is embedded in the template file or may be a reference to where content can be found such as via a URL. See column 1, lines 59-67, column 2, lines 1-28 and 55-67, and column 3. Compare to ***"associating, within a server, each of a plurality***

of content items with a select number of sub-templates selected from a plurality of sub-templates”.

-The template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. Compare to ***“generating an instance file in the server, wherein the instance file specifies a number of content items and associates a respective one of the sub-templates with each of the content items.”***

Krishna teaches content distributed publishing system in which a template comprising various regions is used to render information for a publication. Krishna teaches a template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. Krishna teaches that the template includes a plurality of regions and the objects and actions specified therein, and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the electronic publication. The content of the regions may be dynamically specified in the template file such as interactive behavior, page layout, etc. See column 3, lines 30-35. Krishna's

Art Unit: 2176

“copyholes” are capable of receiving multiple different content items. In column 5, Krishna teaches ***“The content and action to information in the template file are used to change the visual display of the page in response to user inputs. . .The Page Builder accepts the template file and content files as inputs. The Page Builder then proceeds to generate a set of HTML page files that capture all possible visual states specified by the template file. . .The Page Builder program generates an HTML file for each of the possible display states specified by the template file”***. Compare to ***“generating an output file using the template, the sub-templates, and the content items . . .in the undefined region, and a plurality of different combinations of the sub-templates may be associated with the corresponding content items, the undefined region being compatible . . .having a corresponding number of different layout configurations using the same template”***. Although Krishna does not utilize the term “sub-template”, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would define a template as a document or file having a preset format and a sub-template as a portion of a document having a preset format, thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the various regions of Krishna as corresponding to the claimed invention’s “sub-templates” as both Krishna’s regions within the template and a sub-template would provide a skeleton for the publishing layout to better organize content as well as reduce human overhead for page-by-page revision and updating. See column 2, lines 22-30.

In reference to claim 2, Krishna teaches that the content items/objects can be associated with user actions. See column 3, lines 49-55. Furthermore, Krishna teaches that when a client computer wishes to view a template file and makes a request to the server, the template file is downloaded to the browser and the viewer will use URLs to obtain the content and action information from the servers. See column 5, lines 15-50.

In reference to claim 3, Krishna teaches that the request is sent from a client computer before the templates are associated with the content items. See column 5.

In reference to claim 4, Krishna teaches that the object content might be embedded in the template file or may be a reference to where content can be found such as via a URL. See column 1, lines 59-67, column 2, lines 1-28 and 55-67, and column 3. Thus if the object content is embedded in the template file, it does not correspond to the request identifier.

In reference to claim 7, Krishna teaches that the template containing instructions for creating visual representations of objects for the publication, the objects described by content information and actions to be taken on such objects. The viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer, receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. As a copyhole refers to a location where content is to be placed in a document, Krishna's regions in the template are analogous to a copyhole.

In reference to claim 8, Krishna discloses that the viewer program is executed in the context of HTML browser program that accesses the at least one server computer,

receives the template and objects and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the publication. See columns 7-8. Regions are analogous to sub-templates.

In reference to claim 9, Krishna discloses in figure 2 that two different regions on the template can be of different heights where one height is a whole number multiple of another sub-template. See figure 2, elements a and b. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that having different regions on a publication page would be necessary when dealing with content of different lengths and formats.

Claims 10-13 and 16-18 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-4 and 7-9 respectively above.

Claims 19-22 and 25-27 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-4 and 7-9 respectively above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 01/06/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Examiner has taken official notice for "various" claim limitations as being "well known". It is noted that if applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. The claim limitations referred to by the Applicant

were presented in previous office action(s) and were not previously challenged and thus became admitted prior art. Furthermore, Examiner's interpretation of the term "sub-template" is interpreted in light of the Applicant's written description and is not Official Notice. However, to additionally support the previously presented rejection(s), Examiner will present a dictionary definition of the term "template".

Template: a document or file having a *preset format*, used as a starting point for a particular application so that the format does not have to be recreated each time it is used (see Dictionary Definition available at: <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=template>).

In view of this definition and Applicant's specification, a sub-template allows for the placement of multiple items within an electronic publication. The sub-templates place content items in a document and provides for the creation of undefined regions within such a document. Krishna teaches content distributed publishing system in which a template comprising various regions is used to render information for a publication. Although Krishna does not utilize the term "sub-template", a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would define a template as a document or file having a preset format and a sub-template as a portion of a document having a preset format, thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the various regions of Krishna as corresponding to the claimed invention's "sub-templates" as both Krishna's regions within the template and a sub-template would provide a skeleton for the publishing layout to better organize content as well as reduce human overhead for page-by-page revision and updating. See column

2, lines 22-30. The page builder also incorporates therein a set of transition actions between the visual representations.

Applicant argues Krishna does not teach the use of a template in a portion of a document comprising an undefined region. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 2, lines 22-29, Krishna discloses ***“The advantage of using such a template tool is that the publisher does not need to know, at the time of designing the page, the exact nature of or the amount of information to be displayed. Specifically, through calls to information sources, the template can be filled automatically with current information with much reduced human overhead for page-by-page revision and updating.”*** Krishna’s teachings indicate that there is not a set size or set content for the various regions existing in the template. In fact, Krishna further teaches ***“providing a way for publishers to view the production of web pages as a dynamic content process”***. See column 2. Krishna’s “copyholes” are capable of receiving multiple different content items. In column 5, Krishna teaches ***“The content and action to information in the template file are used to change the visual display of the page in response to user inputs. . . The Page Builder accepts the template file and content files as inputs. The Page Builder then proceeds to generate a set of HTML page files that capture all possible visual states specified by the template file. . . The Page Builder program generates an HTML file for each of the possible display states specified by the template file”***. Krishna teaches a content distributed publishing system in which a template comprising various regions is used to render information for a publication.

Applicant argues that Krishna discloses an unlimited amount of space for a given web page and thus fails to show the use of sub-templates. Examiner respectfully disagrees since Krishna discloses content distributed publishing system in which a template comprising various regions is used to render information for a publication. The regions can be populated with content consisting of *various fonts and text attributes*.

Applicant amendment recites, ***“a plurality of different combinations of the sub-templates may be associated with the corresponding content items, the undefined region being compatible with any one of the different combinations of the sub-templates, thereby facilitating the creation of a plurality of documents having a corresponding number of different layout configurations using the same template”***. Krishna teaches that the template includes a plurality of regions and the objects and actions specified therein, and renders the information in the template files for display within each region of the electronic publication. *The content of the regions may be dynamically specified in the template file such as interactive behavior, page layout, etc. See column 3, lines 30-35.* Krishna’s “copyholes” are capable of receiving multiple different content items. In column 5, Krishna teaches ***“The content and action to information in the template file are used to change the visual display of the page in response to user inputs. . . The Page Builder accepts the template file and content files as inputs. The Page Builder then proceeds to generate a set of HTML page files that capture all possible visual states specified by the template file. . . The Page Builder program generates an HTML file for each of the possible display states specified by the template file”***.

In view of comments and rejections above, Examiner's position is maintained.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2176

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS

03/27/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Doug Hutton", written over a horizontal line.

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176